



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/821,650	03/28/97	FRYE	R PWR 002 P2

JOSEPH G NAUMAN
PO BOX 292470
DAYTON OH 45429

PM11/0312

EXAMINER
WERNER, F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3652	2

DATE MAILED: 03/12/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/821650

Applicant(s)

Robert L. Frye et al

Examiner

F. E. Werner

Group Art Unit

3652

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 ~~is/are~~ pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 ~~is/are~~ rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 3652

-Part III-

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re base claims 1 and 5, no means to raise and lower the boom and to swing the boom have been set forth rendering the claims incomplete; further, it is not understood where the packages are received from ~~one~~^{or} delivered to ; also, it is not understood (in the absence of function therefor) why the belt and side rails are of a non-conductive material.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 3652

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaumer in view of Dennis and Spiegl.

Gaumer discloses a mobile conveyor having a boom with non-conducting side boards H^2 , rollers (mounted on shafts E^2 and I^2) supporting endless belt K^2 with lugs L^2 , swinging means K^1 and raising/lowering means M^2 , etc., but does not specifically disclose a non-conductive belt with is taught by Dennis ^(c) and in view of the same, it would have been obvious to have substituted a non-conductive belt as taught by Dennis. That the return flight pass through a passage formed by cross members in order to shield the return flight is rendered obvious by Spiegl (Fig. 2). It moreover would have been obvious to have conventionally handled packages. Re claims 2 (and 5) and 3 (and 5), it would have been obvious to have substituted equivalent conventional materials such as fiberglass reinforced plastic means and polypropylene, respectively. Re claims 4 and 6, the substitution of ^{an} equivalent conventional hydraulic motor (as claimed) would have been obvious.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3652

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to F. E. Werner at telephone number (703) 308-1113.

Summary:

Claims 1-6 are rejected.

Rejection-SSP 3mos.

Werner/oc
March 5, 1999

Frank E. Werner

FRANK E. WERNER 3/99
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3652